

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 4, 7-8, 12-13, 16, 18, 20-21, 25-27, 30-33, 37-40, 43-44, and 47-49 have been amended. Claims 1-2, 4-18, 20-41, and 43-49 are pending in the application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 1, 4, 7-8, 12-13, 16, 18, 20-21, 25-27, 30-33, 37-40, 43-44, and 47-49 have been amended in minor fashion, and are accordingly in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hong (US 2005/0040393). Claims 3, 19, and 42 were previously canceled. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a method of forming a pixel cell of an imaging device comprising, *inter alia*, "forming at least one transistor in said pixel cell to have a gate and source/drain regions on opposite sides of said gate, at least one of said source/drain regions having no halo implant, wherein at least one of said source/drain regions has no lightly doped drain implant" (emphasis added). Claims 16, 28, and 40 recite similar limitations. Hong does not disclose these limitations.

To the contrary, Hong discloses in the description of FIG. 5F, which is a cross section of the pixel 300, shown in FIGs. 2B and 4A-4C, that "lightly doped drain (LDD) implants are performed by known techniques to provide LDD regions 305a and 307a." Hong paragraph [0054] (emphasis added). Although the Office Action takes the position that FIGs. 4A-4C show no LDD implant, the referenced figures are schematic views of the same pixel shown in cross-section in FIG. 5F, and do not show the detail as illustrated in FIG. 5F. See Hong paragraphs [0017]-[0019], and [0025]. Hong does not disclose any other source or drain regions. Therefore, since the only source or drain

regions disclosed in Hong have lightly doped drain (LDD) implants, there is no disclosure of at least one of said source/drain regions having no lightly doped drain implant as recited in claim 1. Since Hong does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1, claim 1 and dependent claims 2-15 are not anticipated by Hong.

Since Hong does not disclose all the limitations of claims 1, 16, 28, and 40, claims 1, 16, 28, and 40 are not anticipated by Hong. Claims 2, 4-15, 17-18, 20-27, 29-41, and 43-49 depend, respectively, from claims 1, 16, 28, and 40, and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above, and on their own merits. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-49 be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: July 19, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Rachael Lea Leventhal

Registration No.: 54,266

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant